

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/652,142	08/29/2003		Chandrasekhar Narayanaswami	YOR920030221US1 (590.108)		
35195	7590	01/03/2005		EXAMINER		
FERENCE 400 BROAI			PHAM,	PHAM, LAM P		
PITTSBUR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
·				2636	2636	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A	4 1	Alicent(a)					
		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summany			,142	NARAYANASWAMI ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examin	er	Art Unit					
		Lam P		2636					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on t	the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comre period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3) period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION.  c of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nunication.  d) days, a reply within the satutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a reply be tin statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 29 August 20	03.						
	,	2b)⊠ This action is							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicat	ion Papers			,					
9)[	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.							
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ction to the drawing(s	) be held in abeyance. Se	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	•	<del>-</del>		).				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	documents have be documents have be of the priority docu onal Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in Applicati ments have been receive tule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2)	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail Da						

Application/Control Number: 10/652,142

Art Unit: 2636

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- Claims 3, 9 and their dependent claims 4-6 and 10-12 rejected under 35
   U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claims 3 and 9 recites the limitation "the authorized user" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-2, 7-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Park** (US 6418536).

**Regards claim 1**, Park disclose a method for managing energy consumption of a device, comprising the steps of:

ascertaining the proximity of an user to the device (proximity sensor 20); and

Application/Control Number: 10/652,142 Page 3

Art Unit: 2636

adjusting the energy consumption of the device, whereby the energy consumption is adjusted based upon the proximity of the user to the device; turning off the back-light unit of the LCD panel if no user is in range of the sensor; see Figures 1-4; col. 3, lines 1-67; col. 4, lines 1-67.

Regards claim 2, Park discloses the energy is provided to the device (portable computer) by batteries (rechargeable batteries) as known in the art; see Abstract.

**Regards claim 7**, Park discloses a system for managing energy consumption of a device, comprising:

an arrangement for ascertaining the proximity of an user to the device, (proximity sensor 20); and

an arrangement for adjusting the energy consumption of the device, whereby the energy consumption is adjusted based upon the proximity of the user to the device; see Figures 1-4; col. 3, lines 1-67 and col. 4, lines 1-67.

**Regards claim 8**, Park discloses the energy is provided to the device (portable computer) by batteries (rechargeable batteries) as known in the art; see Abstract.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2636

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsirkel et al. (US 6665805)

Regards claim 13, Tsirkel et al. disclose a program storage device (memory 106) readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the method steps for managing energy consumption of a device, comprising the steps of:

ascertaining the proximity of an user to the device (camera 130); and adjusting the energy consumption of the device, whereby the energy consumption is adjusted based upon the proximity of the user to the device; see figures 1-2; col. 1, lines 63-67; col. 2, lines 1-67.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 3-6, 9-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Nguyen (US 6771168).

**Regards claim 3**, Park fails to disclose an RFID tag is used in connection with ascertaining the proximity of the user to the device.

Nguyen in "automotive system to prevent car jacking" teaches of using an RFID tag in connection with ascertaining the proximity of a user to a device (car); the RFID tag kept by an authorized user and an interrogating system on the car that periodically reads the RFID tag in order to confirm that the authorized user has permission to operate the vehicle. In the event that the user has been out of the car out of range (30ft), the RFID tag will no longer in proximity to the interrogating system and the control system will then shut down the operation of vehicle engine as seen in Figure 1; col. 2, lines 19-67 and col. 3, lines 1-10.

In view of Nguyen teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to make use of an RFID tag for ascertaining the proximity of an authorized user to the device whether the device is a computer, a cellular phone or a car system.

Regards claim 4, Park and Nguyen both fail to disclose the RFID tag is an active tag. However, it has been known in the art of RFID tag to use a passive tag not having a battery or an active tag having a battery for powering the tag itself. The passive tag obtains power from the interrogator and is smaller in size, while the active tag obtains power from the battery and has better control of the transmission range. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to alternatively use an active RFID tag having controlled transmission range for ascertaining the proximity of an authorized user to the device.

Regards claim 5, Park and Nguyen's combined teaching of would make it obvious that the energy consumption of the device is decreased when the user is not

Application/Control Number: 10/652,142

Art Unit: 2636

proximate to the device whether using sensor (20) or an RFID tag for ascertaining the proximity of the user to the device as seen in the Abstract of Park.

Regards claim 6, Park and Nguyen fail to expressly disclose the proximity of the user to the device at which the energy consumption of the device is adjusted maybe varied. Since the proximity detection using an RFID tag having a predetermined range of communication, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to realize that the interrogator or reader can be configured to operate in different ranges as well known in the art of RFID tag so that a user can set the operating distance as desired for managing energy consumption of the device.

Regards claim 9, referring to claim 3 for explanation.

Regards claim 10, referring to claim 4 for explanation.

Regards claim 11, referring to claim 5 for explanation.

Regards claim 12, referring to claim 6 for explanation.

#### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nielsen et al. US 6734845) disclose an eye-track-driven illumination and information display. (\*)

Magee et al. (US 2003/0051181 A1) disclose a proximity based apparatus for reducing electrical energy consumed by a personal computer with sleep mode. Application/Control Number: 10/652,142 Page 7

Art Unit: 2636

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lam P Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-2977. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery A Hofsass can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lam Pham December 21, 2004

> SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600